

In re Patent Application of:
CLARKE ET AL.
Serial No. **10/785,657**
Filing Date: **Feb. 24, 2004**

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, 15, 17-22, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-36, 38, 39, and 42-43 remain in this application. Claims 4, 6, 14, 16, 23, 27, 30, 31, 37, 40, 41, and 44 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 21, 32, and 42 have been amended.

Applicants note that the Information Disclosure Statement and PTO-1449 form was filed with this patent application on February 24, 2004. The Office Action did not include the initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form indicating that the Examiner had considered the Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants submit with this Amendment a copy of the PTO-1449 form, the Information Disclosure Statement document, and a copy of the return postcard indicating that the Patent Office had received the IDS. **Applicants request an initialed copy for their records to complete the file.**

Applicants file a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to have the Examiner consider this Amendment in which further details of the protocol interface device, including the front-end proxy module, device information module operative with the front-end proxy module, and the associated device configuration file database associated with the device information module and the knowledge database associated with the front-end proxy module, are now recited in the independent claims, including the appropriate functions and interrelationships among the various elements in order to place this case in condition for allowance.

Applicants note the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 10-19, 21-24, 29-32, 34, 37, and 39-44 as anticipated by Poor, which had been discussed in the previous Amendment and Office

In re Patent Application of:

CLARKE ET AL.

Serial No. **10/785,657**

Filing Date: **Feb. 24, 2004**

Action, and other claims as obvious over Poor in view of Wedeking, or Poor in view of Cates. Poor discloses an intermediate server 12 that has knowledge of an application program protocol as used by an application program in a wireless device. Poor translates information communicated with the device in accordance with a transport-level protocol by using data in server configuration file database 22 and a user configuration database 24. It is evident that the claimed invention presents a different structure and function as compared to Poor.

As now claimed, a front-end proxy module is operative as an agent and communicates with the plurality of mobile wireless devices using different operating protocols. This front-end proxy module could include a number of different proxies as indicated in FIG. 1 for WAP, POP, MAP or HTTP. The front-end proxy module is operative with a knowledge database that is operatively connected to the front-end proxy module. This database stores data relating to functional features of different wireless mobile communications devices. The front-end proxy module can query the knowledge database and determine the functional features of the wireless mobile communications devices in communication with the protocol interface device.

A device information module is also operative with the front-end proxy module. A configuration file database is associated with the device information module and stores configuration files used for configuring the front-end proxy module based on the functional features that had been determined by the front-end proxy module and the knowledge database it had queried. The device information module would

In re Patent Application of:
CLARKE ET AL.
Serial No. **10/785,657**
Filing Date: **Feb. 24, 2004**

query the device configuration file and determine and select a configuration file that can configure the front-end proxy module to interface with the wireless mobile communications device and enable communications of any desired alerts that are notifications indicative of an event. In the last Amendment Applicants argued that Poor does not suggest the communication of "alerts." Applicants still affirm this argument and note that Poor translates an entire email message as compared to the alerts as claimed, which could correspond to a simple notification indicative of an event, such as a telephone message.

As to the present Amendment, Poor uses a different set of modules, and uses a server configuration file that stores data used by server computers to perform general tasks. It uses a protocol database to describe application-level protocols and identify application programs with which they are associated. For example, it can describe the POP3 protocol associated with a YAHOO mail service. The user configuration file database 24 includes lists or configuration blocks 26 of users identified by login identification numbers.

It is clear Poor is much different because it teaches a server and no clearly defined modules with set functions. Two databases are associated with one server function as compared to the protocol interface device as part of a mobile office platform, which as now claimed, includes the front-end proxy module operative for querying the knowledge database to determine functional features of the wireless mobile communications device, and then a device information module operative with the front-end proxy module, and which based upon the determined functional features,

In re Patent Application of:

CLARKE ET AL.

Serial No. **10/785,657**

Filing Date: **Feb. 24, 2004**

queries a device configuration file database and selects a configuration file for configuring the front-end proxy module to interface with the wireless mobile communications device and enable communication of any desired alerts that are notifications indicative of an event.

This interrelated module and database structure and function has been found advantageous because the two databases as claimed and operative with the claimed different modules is efficient for operation and allow the updating of data to different functions, which can occur quite often in the changing world of a wireless communications environment. Also, as illustrated, the device information module is operative with the protocol engine module 32 that communicates with the data storage devices using the respective operating protocols. Indeed, as noted in Claim 32, new data regarding functional features can be obtained and stored, which is not suggested by Poor in the manner as claimed.

None of these claimed features and functions are disclosed or suggested by Poor alone, or Poor in combination with Wedeking or Cates. Wedeking is directed to identifying unauthorized users of cellular telephones using ESN registration data to determine a match between the stored ESN and an input ESN. Wedeking determines if a mobile wireless communications device is authorized to use a network. Cates is directed to balancing servers to update multiple servers without taking multiple servers off-line while the load balancing spreads requests for service that could be made to a single address across multiple servers. It solves the problem of updating servers in an automated fashion without bringing down an entire set of servers. Cates does not suggest any


In re Patent Application of:
CLARKE ET AL.
Serial No. **10/785,657**
Filing Date: **Feb. 24, 2004**

default configuration. The combination of Poor in view of Wedeking or Poor in view of Cates does not suggest the claimed invention as now presented in this Amendment and described above.

Applicants contend that the present case is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due.

If the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for placing this case in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD K. WARTHER
Reg. No. 32,180
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
Phone: 407-841-2330

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: **MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450**, on this 27th day of October, 2005.

